

August 8, 2017

CLARIFICATION NO. 1

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS – CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES

NOTICE TO INTERESTED PARTIES:

The following clarifications, amendments, additions and/or deletions as set forth herein shall apply to the above documents and shall be made a part thereof and shall be subject to all the requirements thereof as though originally specified and/or shown. Submitters shall assure themselves that all addendum changes have been incorporated into their proposal.

A. CLARIFICATIONS

1. Page 1, first paragraph, lists three (3) potential projects (and refers to Attachment A for further descriptions). These projects are the Municipal Service Center, a Non-Potable Water Storage Tank/Pump Station, and the WWTP Expansion. The third paragraph, along with the SCOPE starting at the bottom of page 2, appear to place a premium on Caltrans experience. Specifically, the SCOPE description states that all inspection, construction management, and related activities shall be completed in accordance with a variety of permits and standards. This includes a large number of Caltrans documents, procedures, and guidelines. Based on our extensive experience on water resources and public building projects, Caltrans is typically a reference document for traffic control in public right-of-way and for force account equipment costs. We recognize that additional projects may be added to the listed three (3) projects that are transportation related and are seeking clarification if experience with all the Caltrans requirements and procedures can be reduced for services to be performed on the water resources and building projects?

City Response: While the three potential projects listed in this RFQ are not transportation related, the City of Brentwood does use a lot of Caltrans forms and procedures since we primarily deliver transportation projects. We will want the construction manager to be familiar with our daily inspection reports, weekly statement of working days, requests for information, change order procedures, filing system, etc. which are similar to Caltrans procedures.

The evaluation criteria for "Familiarity with local, state, and federal procedures" will primarily focus on experience with the State Revolving Fund and their specific requirements (Davis-Bacon, DBE, American Iron and Steel), as well as, federal funding. In addition, this is potentially a five year agreement and there may be transportation related projects that will be inspected under this agreement.

2. Page 4, Item C., Documentation and Record Keeping: We use a web based Document Control System (with no additional hardware, software, or licensing requirements to our clients). Is the use of a web based system acceptable to the City? **City Response:** Yes. Make sure access to all required documentation listed in the RFQ is readily available electronically at the project site.

3. Page 6, Item G. Field Inspection (starts on P.5), requires inspection experience on road construction, road widening, and bridge construction. Will this experience be necessary as it relates to the projects described in Attachment A? We recognize that grading and paving will be required at the Tank, Municipal Service Center, and WWTP. These types of projects also typically require significant CM expertise and inspection on civil, cast-in-place concrete structures, equipment installation, mechanical, HVAC, and electrical and instrumentation disciplines. We presume these activities would fall under Item 4, "Other experience applicable to the project." Can you confirm, please?

City Response: New roads and a pedestrian bridge will be constructed as part of the Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion – Phase II Project. The majority of the work for these projects will include structures that will contain the items listed above, as well as compliance with the building code. These items are included in "other experience applicable to the project".

4. Page 8, Section 5.0, Required Content, requires the SOQ to not exceed 5 pages for Items 5.1 -5.8. The following pages list Items 5.1 through 5.7. Is there an Item 5.8 that was omitted from the RFQ? Also, based on the Required Content and Section 7.0, Evaluation Criteria, can you confirm that the SOQ cannot exceed 5 pages in length?

City Response: That is an error and it should read Items 5.1-5.7. The SOQ cannot exceed 5 pages in length but that does not include items that can go in the appendix (resumes, etc.) or the cost proposal.

- 5. Page 9, Items 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 all require specific information related to proposed staffing experience and qualifications. In this regard, we have a couple of questions:
 - a. Can you provide/confirm the anticipated status of funding, design development, and anticipated start of construction for the three (3) listed projects? It is our understanding that the two water resources projects are employing the design-bid-build delivery method and are in varying stages of the SRF process; the Storage Tank plans are being updated as the City waits for SRF funding; the WWTP Expansion 90% design is expected at the end of August 2017. It is our understanding the Municipal Service Center is employing the design-build delivery method and was awarded July 11, 2017. Final design is anticipated to take at least 3 months. The anticipated timing of the projects is important to make sure we are proposing team members that will be available and to investigate the flexibility of our proposed staffing on multiple projects. This is particularly important as it pertains to Section 10, Assurance of Designated Team.

City Response: The Municipal Service Center project is fully funded. It is a design-build project that has already been awarded. We anticipate construction beginning in November 2017 with a 12 month construction schedule. The Non-Potable Water Storage Tank Project is fully funded. The City has executed the agreement with the State for the SRF funds. We need to make some modifications to the plans and we plan to bid this project in a couple months with a 6 month construction schedule. The Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion is under design. The SRF application is still being reviewed by the State. The goal is to bid this project in the summer of 2018 but that may change depending on the funding.

b. In regards to subconsultants, does the City have preferred/pre-selected consultants for services such as labor compliance, materials testing, and/or specialty inspections?

City Response: The City has existing on-call agreements for materials testing that we will be using for these projects. We do not have any preferred sub-consultants for labor compliance or specialty inspection.

6. Page 10, Item 5.7 B.: Does the City prefer three (3) to five (5) references for each of the projects listed in Attachment A (up to a total of nine (9) to 15, or three (3) to five (5) total references?

City Response: 3 to 5 total references, preferably at least one for each potential project.

7. Page 12, Item 11.1, Pre-Award Audit: We presume this will be performed for each project, depending on applicability and necessity. Can you please confirm and/or clarify?

City Response: The Pre-Award Audit will be performed for each project, as needed, at the time when a project proposal is requested.

8. Attachment B, DBE Guidelines: These are typically a requirement of the construction contractor. Please clarify the City's expectations for CM Services; e.g., the Good Faith Efforts described have strict solicitation timing requirements. (These typically pertain to GFE for construction contractor subcontractor solicitation.)

City Response: The State requires DBE for all consultant agreements being funded with SRF funds. The DBE Guidelines in Attachment A came directly from the State. The forms will need to be submitted with each individual project proposal, as needed, at the time when a project proposal is requested. The City will need to see DBEs or a good faith effort with the sub-consultants listed in the statement of qualifications.

9. Attachment 10-H: Are these forms to be completed for each project once the CM selection is determined? These forms require the total hours for each staff member proposed for each project. Additional information on each project scope and duration will produce more accurate and meaningful cost proposals. Since the Selection Criteria does not consider costs, we respectfully suggest that detailed cost proposals be developed upon selection. Perhaps a list of job classifications or personnel and their hourly rates is acceptable for SOQ purposes? Please let us know.

City Response: The RFQ was supposed to only include "Example #2" which does not require the hours for each staff member. The cost proposal following "Example #2" is required with the statement of qualifications. A more detailed cost proposal will be required for each project after the agreement is in place.

-END OF CLARIFICATION NO. -1-

John Samuelson Project Manager